



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

VISTA HEALTHCARE INC
4301 VISTA RD
PASADENA TX 77504-2117

Respondent Name

ARROWOOD INDEMNITY COMPANY

Carrier's Austin Representative Box

Box Number 11

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-03-1907-01

MFDR Date Received

December 18, 2002

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "Vista Healthcare charges the above-referenced services at a fair and reasonable rate. Specifically, these rates are based upon a comparison of charges to other Carriers and the amount of reimbursement received for these same or similar services. The amount of reimbursement deemed to be fair and reasonable by Vista Healthcare is at a minimum of 70% of billed charges. This is supported by a managed care contract with 'Focus' . . . This managed care contract supports Vista Healthcare's argument that the usual and customary charges are fair and reasonable and at the very least, 70% of the usual and customary charges is fair and reasonable . . . the managed care contract shows numerous Insurance Carrier's willingness to provide 70% reimbursement for Ambulatory Surgical Centers medical services."

Amount in Dispute: \$2,292.15

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: The insurance carrier did not submit a response for consideration in this review.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
January 3, 2002	Outpatient Hospital Services	\$2,292.15	\$0.00

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307 sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1 provides for fair and reasonable reimbursement of health care in the absence of an applicable fee guideline.
3. Texas Labor Code §413.011 sets forth provisions regarding reimbursement policies and guidelines.
4. This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on December 18, 2002. Pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3), effective January 2, 2002, 26 *Texas Register* 10934,

applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2002, the Division notified the requestor on January 6, 2003 to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute as set forth in the rule.

5. The submitted explanation of benefits does not contain any payment exception codes or explanations of the reasons for reduction or denial of payment for the disputed services.

Findings

1. This dispute relates to services with reimbursement subject to the provisions of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1(f), effective October 7, 1991, 16 *Texas Register* 5210, which requires that "Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, sec. 8.21(b) [currently Texas Labor Code §413.011(d)], until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission.
2. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
3. Former 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(B), effective January 2, 2002, 26 *Texas Register* 10934, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2002, requires the requestor to send "a copy of any pertinent medical records." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not provided any medical records to support the services in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(g)(3)(B).
4. Former 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(C)(i), effective January 2, 2002, 26 *Texas Register* 10934, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2002, requires the requestor to send a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not provide a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(g)(3)(C)(i).
5. Former 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv), effective January 2, 2002, 26 *Texas Register* 10934, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2002, requires the requestor to send a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the submitted documentation supports the requestor's position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv).
6. Former 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 2, 2002, 26 *Texas Register* 10934, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2002, requires the requestor to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement." Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - The requestor's position statement asserts that "Vista Healthcare charges the above-referenced services at a fair and reasonable rate. Specifically, these rates are based upon a comparison of charges to other Carriers and the amount of reimbursement received for these same or similar services."
 - The requestor did not provide documentation to demonstrate how it determined its usual and customary charges for the disputed services.
 - Documentation of the comparison of charges to other carriers was not presented for review.
 - Documentation of the amount of reimbursement received for these same or similar services was not presented for review.
 - The Division has previously found, as stated in the adoption preamble to the former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, that "hospital charges are not a valid indicator of a hospital's costs of providing services nor of what is being paid by other payors" (22 *Texas Register* 6271). The Division further considered alternative methods of reimbursement that use hospital charges as their basis; such methods were rejected because they "allow the hospitals to affect their reimbursement by inflating their charges" (22 *Texas Register* 6268-6269). Therefore, the use of a hospital's "usual and customary" charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
 - In the alternative, the requestor asks to be reimbursed a minimum of 70% of billed charges, in support of which the requestor states that "The amount of reimbursement deemed to be fair and reasonable by Vista Healthcare is at a minimum of 70% of billed charges. This is supported by a managed care contract with 'Focus' . . . This managed care contract supports Vista Healthcare's argument that the usual and customary charges are fair and reasonable and at the very least, 70% of the usual and customary charges is fair and

reasonable . . . the managed care contract shows numerous Insurance Carrier's willingness to provide 70% reimbursement for Ambulatory Surgical Centers medical services."

- The requestor has provided select exhibit pages from the alleged managed care contract referenced above; however, a copy of the contract referenced in the position statement was not presented for review with this dispute.
- Review of the exhibit pages submitted by the requestor finds a schedule of charges, labeled exhibit "A", dated 04/23/92, which states that "OUTPATIENT SERVICES: 101/401 PAY 70% OF BILLED CHARGES."
- The requestor submitted a letter of clarification dated July 30, 1992 indicating a change in reimbursement to the above referenced contract, stating in part that "services rendered to eligible Beneficiaries will be considered at 80% of the usual and reasonable charge which is equal to the lesser of the actual charges billed by HCP; OR the eightieth (80th) percentile for charges for such services as set forth in the current Medical Data Research Database."
- The requestor submitted a fee schedule page, labeled exhibit A, dated effective August 1, 1992 which states, in part, that the provider shall receive "an amount equal to eighty percent (80%) of the Usual and Reasonable Charge for those Covered Services. For all purposes hereunder, the Usual and Reasonable Charge for such services shall be equal to the lesser of: (i) the actual charges billed by HCP for such services; or (ii) the eightieth (80th) percentile for charges for such services as set forth in the current Medical Data Research database."
- No data or information was submitted from the Medical Data Research database to support the requested reimbursement.
- No documentation was presented by the requestor to support that the referenced contract was in effect at the time of the disputed services.
- While managed care contracts are relevant to determining a fair and reasonable reimbursement, the Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a percentage of a hospital's billed charges does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the adoption preamble to the Division's former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, which states at 22 *Texas Register* 6276 that:

A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources.

Therefore, a reimbursement amount that is calculated based upon a percentage of a hospital's billed charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.

- The requestor did not submit documentation to support that payment of the amount sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in this dispute.
- The requestor did not support that the requested alternative reimbursement methodology would satisfy the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

Conclusion

The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307. The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the disputed services.

Authorized Signature

_____	Grayson Richardson	July 16, 2013
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision*** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party**.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.